
*** TX REPORT ***

TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO	3390	
CONNECTION TEL		97035915907
SUBADDRESS		
CONNECTION ID		
ST. TIME	11/15 10:47	
USAGE T	01'18	
PGS.	2	
RESULT	OK	

Page 1 of 2

To: Steven Prewitt , fax number 703 591 5907
V 703 591 2664 x302

From: Michael Brannock, Patent Examiner, AU 1646, USPTO
v 703 306-5876

Date: 11/15/01

RE: 09370358 Interview Summary

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/370,358

Applicant(s)

Sklar et al.

Examiner

Michael Brannock, Ph.D.

Group Art Unit

1646



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Brannock

(3) _____

(2) Steven Prewitt

(4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 14, 2001Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 1-13 and 15-17

Identification of prior art discussed:

Robeva et al., Eppler et al. and Jones et al.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner indicated "attachment scheme" was indefinite. Suggested that the phrase need not appear in the claim.Examiner indicated that Applicant's proposed amendment of claim 10 to require that at least one ligand be known to bind the receptor would obviate the rejection based on 112(1).Rejections based on Robeva: Examiner pointed out that claims 9, 11 and 16 and 17 do not require that either the step of binding the ligand or the step of sorting receptor/ligand pairs be carried out while the receptor is bound to a solid support.Examiner indicated that any amendment to the claims that would required such a limitation might render the claims obvious over Eppler and/or Jones.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

MICHAEL BRANNOCK, PH.D.
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1646